DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 835 HE 024 694

TITLE	Think Tank Report. The Time is Right for Telling the Union's Story.
INSTITUTION	Association of College Unions-International, Bloomington, IN.
REPORT NO	ISSN-0004-5659
PUB DATE	Jan 91
NOTE	14p.; For a related document, see HE 024 695.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of College Unions-International, 400 E. Seventh St., Bloomington, IN 47405 ($4.00).
PUB TYPE	Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT	ACU-I Bulletin; v59 n1 p20-31 Jan 1991
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; Administrators; *College Environment; Extracurricular Activities; Higher Education; *Institutional Role; Meetings; *Organizational Effectiveness; Role Perception; Social Organizations; *Student College Relationship; *Student Unions

ABSTRACT

This report presents the viewpoints and arguments made during a meeting of higher education administrators who were assembled to discuss how college unions and student activities contribute to a sense of community on campus. The report compares how the union and activities profession views itself with how others perceive it, as well as relating the basic tenets of "The Role of the College Union" to the six principles of community as outlined in the Carnegie Foundation's "Campus Life: In Search of Community." Participants were the following: Winston Shindell, Association of College Unions--International (ACU-I) president; Richard Blackburn, ACU-I executive director; William Brattain, assistant vice-president for student services at Western Illinois University; Frank Cianciola, director of the Michigan Union at the University of Michigan; Ted Crabb, director of the Wisconsin Union at the University of Wisconsin, Madison; Martha Dawson, vice president of academic affairs at Hampton University; Larry Huffman, president of Kankakee Community College; William Johnston, director of Southern Methodist University's Hughes-Trigg Student Center; Bruce Kaiser, director of Northwestern University's Norris University Center; Norman F. Moore, vice chancellor for student services at Louisiana State University; and Elizabeth Nuss, executive director of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Think Tank report

The time is right for telling the union's story

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Association of College Unions-International

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Campus Life: In Search of Community *has become the clarion call on campuses this year. Viewing this new emphasis on community as a golden opportunity, ACU-I President Winston Shindell convened a Think Tank of higher education administrators to discuss how college unions and student activities contribute to a sense of community on campus.*

In this issue, the Think Tank compares how the union and activities profession views itself with how others perceive it, and Shindell relates the basic tenets of "The Role of the College Union" to the six principles of community as outlined in ***Campus Life.*** *The March* ***Bulletin*** *will publish the Think Tank's suggestions for communicating the union's mission as campus community builder.*

HE 024 694

How we are perceived

Winston Shindell: To start off the session, we'd like to give the folks who are not union directors a chance to talk with us about how others see us. How are college unions and student activities seen, particularly from the perspective of the upper administrative levels. What are we doing that you like? What are we doing that you don't like?

Norman Moore: It's difficult to know where to start. I'm having a problem because in higher education we do not have the staffing patterns that allow us to work in the kind of planning mode we were able to operate in 10, 12, 15 years ago—where we could have think tanks, where we could get our own staffs off for a day and talk about where we wanted to be in six months, in five years, in 10 years. With budget crunches throughout the institution, staffing patterns just aren't there. Times are extremely busy, and people are just trying to survive from day to day.

I see universities and colleges turning to auxiliaries like the union and saying, "We need money out of your reserves to help us through this important time in our history." Then the auxiliary becomes unable to maintain itself and stay on the cutting edge. I'm starting to see resentment building in auxiliaries and union-type people about the institution's interest in their money. Unions have a tremendous opportunity to be more connected through their financial powers instead of having the university take money from them. I'm talking about really connecting with academic units and bringing *their* speakers in for them. I'm talking about using bookstore monies to assist scholarship programs.

Let me give you an example. Our athletic director turned the $2 million he invested in the academic budget last year into $10 million worth of good will. About a year ago, the chancellor said: "Joe, you've had an exceptionally fine year budget wise. I need $2 million." Joe gave $2 million, and he turned right around and made one of the finest speeches about supporting higher education and academics, and the university is eating it up. So I'm saying if you want to resent it, resent it, but don't do it publicly.

I think college unions and student activities people ought to be out front of anyone else

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ble 1
erage salaries for each position by gender and experience and overall

	Female Avg. Salary	Years Exper	*Male* Avg Salary	Years Exper	*Overall* # respondents	Average Salary	% Inc	Years Experience
n Dir & Dir St Act	$34,978	8.2	$42,175	13.0	287	$39,654	6.09	11.3
n Director	40,761	9.2	45,743	13.5	180	44,952	5.38	12.9
ciate Director	32,272	8.5	38,134	9.5	102	36,863	5.71	9.2
stant Director	26,527	5.7	29,945	7.2	183	28,871	6.01	6.6
rations Manager	24,920	7.4	28,370	8.2	116	27,263	5.82	8.0
ness Manager	27,333	7.1	35,000	8.4	111	30,528	5.69	7.6
Service Manager	32,696	7.5	36,940	8.9	113	35,992	5.73	8.5
or Recreation Manager	22,038	6.1	23,856	8.7	99	23,636	5.26	8.1
kstore Manager	28,766	7.9	38,965	12.1	107	35,048	5.34	10.5
duling/Reservation Manager	21,235	7.0	24,588	6.7	206	21,826	5.53	6.9
notions/Marketing Manager	23,924	5.0	28,046	4.2	42	25,279	5.51	4.8
tenance Manager	26,971	10.4	26,450	8.6	104	26,594	5.0	8.7
Ticket Center Manager	20,263	7.4	18,400	3.5	71	19,896	5.15	6.7
ciate Director	29,600	7.0	34,209	9.2	51	32,704	6.0	8.2
stant Director	27,048	4.3	26,005	4.6	126	26,772	5.58	4.4
tor Student Activities	30,459	6.2	34,426	8.5	144	32,265	5.64	7.2
ram Director	26,556	6.2	27,520	5.5	93	26,855	5.66	5.9
ram Advisor(s)	22,229	3.6	23,303	3.5	171	22,620	5.09	3.6
ter/Technical Manager	22,120	5.7	24,795	6.5	46	24,525	5.83	6.4
shop Director	23,175	8.0	25,450	10.0	33	24,109	5.09	8.6
oor Recreation Manager	22,092	3.1	24,187	6.9	46	23,422	5.67	5.8
allery Director	24,354	5.3	23,800	7.0	21	24,160	5.9	5.9
rming Arts Manager	29,200	5.0	30,400	5.8	16	29,950	5.48	5.5

Table 2
Number reporting and salary increase rate

	Female	Male	Female	Male
Union Dir & Dir St Activities	100	187	7.1%	5.6%
Union Director	26	154	7.16	5.07
Associate Director	25	73	7.26	5.21
Assistant Director	66	112	5.92	6.07
Operations Manager	30	81	6.48	5.58
Business Manager	63	45	5.52	5.95
Food Service Manager	23	80	5.9	5.67
Indoor Recreation Manager	21	75	5.19	5.32
Bookstore Manager	36	62	5.5	5.25
Scheduling/Reservation Manager	167	32	5.6	5.21
Promotions/Marketing Manager	29	13	5.9	4.19
Maintenance Manager	7	97	4.23	5.05
Info/Ticket Center Manager	57	13	5.17	5.36
Associate Director	26	23	6.08	5.9
Assistant Director	87	34	5.44	5.95
Director of Student Activities	82	62	5.65	5.64
Program Director	59	34	5.16	6.45
Program Advisor	89	64	5.04	5.17
Theater/Technical Manager	5	41	3.5	6.18
Craftshop Director	24	6	5.11	5.06
Outdoor Recreation	13	31	6.73	5.29
Art/Gallery Director	13	7	4.78	7.58
Performing Arts Manager	6	10	7.0	4.8

Theater/ Techn Manager	Craft Director	Outdoor Recr Manager	Art Gallery Director	Perform Arts Manager
13,600		$13,600	$13,600	
20,200		20,500	13,600	
28,600		25,000	13,600	
3		4	1	
18,400	$18,400	18,400	25,000	$28,600
23,680	25,300	26,300	26,800	35,800
28,600	32,200	35,800	28,600	43,000
5	4	6	2	3
13,600	18,400	13,600	13,600	13,600
25,040	20,65u	23,280	21,040	21,200
39,400	21,400	32,200	35,800	28,600
15	4	11	5	3
16,000	18,400	13,600	13,600	25,000
25,500	27,280	22,450	26,650	32,200
32,200	35,800	32,200	35,800	53,800
12	10	9	4	6
16,000	18,400	18,400	21,400	35,800
22,771	21,486	26,560	27,160	35,800
32,200	25,000	43,000	35,800	35,800
7	7	5	5	1
25,000	13,600	18,400	18,400	18,400
25,000	23,700	21,600	18,400	28,900
25,000	32,200	25,000	18,400	39,400
3	5	3	1	2
32,200	21,400	21,400	21,400	21,400
32,200	21,400	21,400	21,400	21,400
32,200	21,400	21,400	21,400	21,400
1	1	1	1	1

Operation Positions

	Assoc Director	Asst Director	Operat Manager	Business Manager	Food Service Director	Indoor Recr Manager	Bkstore Manager	Schedul & Reserv Manager	Promo Mktg Manager	Maint Manager	Info/ Ticket Manager
Under 1,000											
Low		$13,600			$21,400	$21,400	$18,400	$13,600	$21,400	$13,600	
Average		18,700			22,600	21,400	20,629	16,000	21,400	13,600	
High		21,400			25,000	21,400	25,000	18,400	21,400	13,600	
Count		6			3	1	7	4	1	1	
1,000-2,500											
Low	$25,000	13,600	$16,000	$21,400	16,000	16,000	18,400	13,600		13,600	$13,600
Average	28,000	23,467	22,300	28,600	28,400	25,600	27,480	19,695		19,300	19,000
High	32,200	35,800	28,600	43,000	50,200	32,200	64,600	28,600		25,000	25,000
Count	6	18	2	4	12	3	15	19		2	3
2,501-5,000											
Low	16,000	16,000	13,600	21,400	18,400	18,400	18,400	13,600	18,400	16,000	13,600
Average	32,341	27,520	24,186	30,400	30,443	21,640	33,368	21,952	26,560	26,400	16,500
High	61,000	39,400	57,400	43,000	39,400	28,600	46,600	61,000	28,600	35,800	28,600
Count	17	25	14	8	14	5	19	22	5	9	6
5,000-10,000											
Low	18,400	16,000	13,600	18,400	21,400	16,000	25,000	13,600	13,600	13,600	13,600
Average	32,512	26,085	24,156	26,500	33,400	23,409	37,126	21,215	24,900	20,625	19,067
High	43,000	43,000	61,000	43,000	50,200	32,200	57,400	43,000	32,200	32,200	28,600
Count	25	47	27	30	18	23	19	52	6	24	18
10,001-20,000											
Low	25,500	18,400	16,000	18,400	28,600	13,600	21,400	13,600	13,600	13,600	13,600
Average	37,384	31,842	27,055	31,812	38,320	22,091	40,965	21,777	23,015	27,771	20,422
High	53,800	46,600	50,200	57,400	68,200	35,800	53,800	35,800	35,800	43,000	35,800
Count	23	51	34	34	30	31	23	62	13	34	27
20,001-30,000											
Low	32,200	25,000	16,000	21,400	35,800	13,600	28,600	13,600	13,600	18,400	13,600
Average	46,825	32,920	30,571	32,624	44,662	24,029	40,600	25,023	24,760	30,343	20,154
High	57,400	53,800	46,600	46,600	57,400	32,200	46,600	46,600	39,400	43,000	32,200
Count	15	15	18	16	13	21	6	25	10	21	13
30,001-40,000											
Low	28,600	25,000	21,400	25,000	46,600	25,000	43,000	18,400	28,600	25,000	21,400
Average	43,800	35,440	35,400	35,800	52,600	28,600	57,400	23,133	32,200	29,500	26,200
High	64,600	53,800	43,000	53,800	61,000	32,200	71,800	35,800	35,800	35,800	28,600
Count	9	8	8	7	3	5	2	9	4	6	3
Over 40,000											
Low	39,400	32,200	28,600	28,600	28,600	21,400	18,400	21,400	18,400	28,600	21,400
Average	44,800	33,640	32,200	33,100	43,720	28,600	46,800	22,600	27,100	37,600	21,400
High	50,200	39,400	35,800	43,000	71,800	35,800	71,800	25,000	35,800	50,200	21,400
Count	2	4	4	4	5	5	3	3	2	4	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in student leadership development. Unions do a "fantabulous" job with their own students and their own leadership programs within their facilities and for their own programs. The potential is outside that arena, in the orientation and development of student leadership campuswide. You have the expertise, you have the wherewithal to really make a contribution.

Martha Dawson: I think the faculty see the union as a student activity, something the other people do. The students have fun, and many times it takes away from the academic arena. So you don't have any bonding between the academic leaders and student personnel, college union leaders. And of course, there is the reward system of promotion and tenure. I can't think of any case where service to the community and what a faculty member had done for students figured into a promotion and tenure decision. Until you build that into the reward system, you're not going to get the bonding and the respect for what you do.

Larry Huffman: I second that thought. I had jotted a note here about faculty perceiving student activities and the college union as fun and games. It is not something that supplements the classroom, but instead competes for the time the student should be studying. The other thing is probably an inaccurate, gross generalization, but I'll say it anyway and maybe stimulate more conversation: My perception is that the more scholarly the faculty think a campus is, the less likely it is that those faculty were engaged in student activities or were student leaders themselves. They might have been the bookworms who were studying at the library all the time and didn't have time for fun and games. Because they didn't experience it themselves, they don't see its value for their students. That is a problem.

Bruce Kaiser: You could take it a step further. Many at a major research institution such as ours feel that unions and activities aren't necessary, that there's a certain amount of bonding at the graduate level, where it's appropriate, and that undergraduates should be spending more time in the library.

Shindell: What you're talking about are perceptions of how we're seen. Could you talk a little about expectations?

Huffman: Part of the problem is there aren't any. You exist and always have. I don't think presidents have expectations of what they want you to do. Presidents are accused of dealing with the B's: the Boards, the Buildings, the Bonds and not much with students and student life. Probably one of the problems is the presidents haven't been asked to think about what they expect of student activities programs.

Think Tank participants

Winston Shindell, ACU-I president and director of the Indiana Memorial Union at Indiana University–Bloomington, chaired the Think Tank.

Richard Blackburn is ACU-I's executive director.

William Brattain is assistant vice president for student services at Western Illinois University and an at-large member of ACU-I's Executive Committee.

Frank Cianciola is director of the Michigan Union at the University of Michigan and an at-large member of ACU-I's Executive Committee.

Ted Crabb is director of the Wisconsin Union at the University of Wisconsin–Madison.

Martha Dawson is vice president of academic affairs at Hampton University.

Larry Huffman is president of Kankakee Community College.

William Johnston is director of Southern Methodist University's Hughes-Trigg Student Center and ACU-I's president-elect.

Bruce Kaiser is director of Northwestern University's Norris University Center.

Norman F. Moore is vice chancellor for student services at Louisiana State University.

Elizabeth Nuss is executive director of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Dawson: You may be your own worst enemies. Have you sat down and told your story to the university. What do you do? And what are the results? Have you tried to work with the academic people when you're having a problem? You have to market yourself in terms of what the university is all about. One way would be to work with presidents and vice presidents to see that you are on the prestige committees where you have to work with people on an issue that's not always student activities, but relates to it. . . . You have to toot your own horn and say, "I'd like to be on the Freshman Orientation Committee."

Shindell: Larry, I want to ask you a question and then ask Martha the same question. As a president, what would you like to hear from us?

Huffman: Many presidents would like to be

aware of what it is you're doing now or what you have done. I'm not sure many understand that you are doing anything. They see the very visible things—the student government, athletics, and things like that—but I'm not sure they know everything you do.

Perhaps a lot of presidents would just like to know that you folks recognize there are some problems to be taken on. Some presidents might like to know they have some allies on campus who share their concerns and have some possible approaches for combating the problems facing the institution.

Dawson: I would like to see you getting faculty more involved at the grass-roots level. For example, if you are working with students who are running for office, I would like you to utilize political science faculty. I would like to see those students working with you in student activities or on the union board knowing the campus resources they could use.

At some point we just have to stop worrying about what went on before and see what is happening right now as a real moment of readiness. We have some moments of opportunity in terms of the way presidents feel about campus climate.

Shindell: Is it realistic to do that if that involvement is not rewarded by the institution?

Dawson: I think the institution would eventually reward the involvement if the organization or the people in the organization could document how it impacts the goals of the institution. For example, if your school was dealing with declining enrollment, and you had a tutorial program that had some impact on retention, and you could document its success—not just talk about it—people would take note. But you have to present it in a way people will respect it: It has to be researched, it has to be involvement, it has to be published. Sometimes people in student activities are so tied up with the nuts and bolts that they don't tell their own story.

Moore: I think it goes back to what Larry was saying. Many faculty think a lot of what we do is fun and games. We talk about it in our jargon, but they don't know any more about our jargon than we know about their political science or history or math or whatever their particular field is. If we spent as much time doing what it is we're supposed to be doing as we do running around trying to defend it to everyone, it would get done and we wouldn't have to be defending much of anything. I don't see the programs happening. I don't see the activities pulling the university together.

Nuss

What is it you take to the person you report to? Do you take new, innovative ideas? Or do you go in and talk about the sociology department not buying their books in your bookstore when university policy says they must? All too often, vice chancellors, vice presidents, and presidents hear the complaints from us more than they hear, "It seems to me the institution is moving in this direction. I and my staff have a lot of expertise in that area and can help make this thing go." Then name them and talk about who can assist.

Bill Brattain: I have a feeling a lot of our comments relate to residential, research, or regional universities. Yet about 18 percent of our membership are two-year institutions. Larry, do you see some differences in what we have talked about as it pertains to the two-year schools?

Huffman: There might be more similarities than differences when you talk about students themselves. One thing we have in common is that our students start out in high school getting into bad habits. These youngsters are pretty much alienated, disenfranchised, or at the least, taking up their spare time with work and activities that don't lead to anything productive. When they go to college they do pretty much the same thing. When students have

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

started out in high school with those bad habits, it is tough to break them.

Some students just aren't very responsible. I see very few with a commitment to doing anything to help their fellow man. They think about "me and what benefits me, what gets me ahead." That is tough to deal with in terms of programming at the community college and at the university.

At the university level, some staff and faculty perhaps are a bit envious of the fact you have a union building all to yourself. They have just a faculty office and a classroom they get on a kind of loan basis from semester to semester. They don't see the building generating anything or being of value. They see it consuming space and dollars and taking away from what they perceive they could have if that building didn't exist. That building serves as a monument to what they perhaps despise as much as anything.

Dawson

Getting back to Martha's earlier comment—student activities and college union people should get on any committee where the important decisions are made. You need to find out if the institution is committed to producing citizens for a democratic society. Ultimately, that's what we're all about, but I'm not sure many of our institutions talk much about that when they start planning. We talk about increasing enrollment, increasing revenue, decreasing expenditures, becoming more productive, and we forget that students are why we exist in the first place. Community colleges and universities could both benefit by involving student activities people in planning.

I would like to see you getting faculty involved at the grass-roots level. . . . I would like to see those students working with you . . . knowing the campus resources they could use.

Bill Johnston: I have a very different view of the world. I don't see students as being materialistic or not concerned. I see volunteer programs on our campus that are staffed and operated beyond any level in the Kennedy era when VISTA and Peace Corps were going on. We can't keep up with the volunteerism.

One more comment. You mentioned that we're in this for students, and I challenge that. I don't think all of us in higher education are in it for students. In fact, that faculty group Martha alluded to earlier sometimes considers students a necessary evil. I don't think they sense an obligation to the overall development of students beyond the requirements of a given discipline. I'm not sure they're not more into their own research.

Liz Nuss: A couple of observations. One is this notion of what the presidents hear in the meetings. I find it fascinating that Ernie Boyer is addressing ACE about the campus community before talking to anybody else, and the presidents sit there as if the sky has opened up and a new dawn has taken place. The rest of us sit there saying, "We know, we know." So in some way, something has happened. We can take it from any vantage point, but at some point we just have to stop worrying about what went on before and see what is happening right now as a real moment of readiness. We have some moments of opportunity in terms of the way presidents feel about campus climate.

I think the public credibility for American higher education has probably never been lower, and I don't think we've seen the bottom. What that means is that presidents and boards have to reach out for every form of assistance and collaboration they can get to begin to make a change. We have an economy that's in trouble, we have Congress that has little respect for higher education, we have the public who holds us accountable in lots of different ways and has higher expectations for us.

We could look at all this as a positive: We have finally become an acceptable social institution; we're now criticized just as much as all

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the other social institutions. We are no longer revered. Within that, there are some opportunities for us, and looking back may not be as positive as trying to stop where we are and project to a very uncertain future.

Self-perceptions

Shindell: What we would like to do now is to give those of us directly involved in college unions and campus activities programs an opportunity to talk about how we think we're being perceived and how we would like to be perceived.

Ted Crabb: My comments will be at the level of how I think we should be perceived, how I think we should be functioning on a campus. It starts with unions being part of the total educational institution.

Crabb

In fulfilling that role we have a dual responsibility. We have to be responsive to the service needs of the campus, and that involves financial responsibilities that oftentimes take precedence, and we also have a responsibility to provide a social, cultural, and recreational program for the entire university community—students, faculty, staff, and alumni.

The most successful unions are the ones that can articulate exactly what it is they're supposed to be doing, and do the best job they can to implement that philosophy of being part of the educational fabric of the university.

Much of what we are all about is bringing people together, and this argument over whether it's a student union or a university union to me is fundamental. We have to communicate that image that we're involving the entire university community. If students see the name Student Union over the front entrance, that's what they expect. If we identify ourselves as a university union and work hard to involve faculty and keep trying to get faculty and staff into the building, students begin to respond to that.

Much of what we are all about is bringing people together, and this argument over whether it's a student union or a university union . . . is fundamental. We have to communicate that . . . we are involving the entire university community.

Frank Cianciola: Norman commented that universities are looking to the auxiliaries because that's where the funds are. From where some of us sit, that may not be fact. That pot of funds may not always be available. The financial pressures being placed on unions are very similar to what is being placed on the universities as well. I understand the context of the comment is, "I have a budget problem, and you have to help." And I think that's very positive. We need to be able to respond to that.

Larry's comment on the faculty's jealousy of the building struck a note with me. We pride ourselves on making the union as spotless and as welcoming as possible. I never thought about it in the context of faculty resenting that because of their "rented" office space. We have a job selling why it's important to the institution to have the kind of space found in a union that can be shared by all.

We ought to hold to the philosophy that students who are involved feel better about themselves and the university when they're in the union. If they feel better about the university, then they're more likely to stay in school. And if they're more likely to stay in school and have a positive experience, they're going to be productive alumni. Somehow we need to better articulate that message to presidents, academic vice presidents, and faculty because I think there is some documentation that will support that.

We also need to be a positive complement to the academic classroom. We're not a substitute for, we're not in competition with, but we are a complement to the classroom. Campus programs, services, and facilities that complement the classroom have to enhance the over-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

all value of the institution.

The union is important to a university in the context of space and philosophy and flexibility. To negotiate away the space designed for unique purposes because it may be expedient at this time and place may forego the opportunity to have that flexible space respond to a more urgent crisis in the university at a later time. Look at this room. At a time of university crisis, someone could say, "It would be great if we put four offices in here." But the interaction that can created by a room like this or an activity like the one we're creating right here is an important commodity. We shouldn't sacrifice those assets in the short term because in the long term they would pay greater dividends.

Dick Blackburn: I think we have an image problem, but that's nothing new. When I first got involved in ACU-I in the '60s during the big boom years of college union buildings appearing on college campuses, we were very concerned that *Newsweek* and *Time* both published articles highly critical of this new movement. These magazines emphasized what they called the campus playpen approach. Our Association got very concerned about this image and tried to counter that image.

We had the sandbox image then, and now we have an image problem of a different nature. The problem we have now is that we are being viewed as campus service stations. This is partly of our own making. As top administrators have pressured us to become more self-sustaining, we've become more entrepreneurial. As we've found ways to generate income, we've looked more and more like a service station. At our directors' meetings, we spend all our time talking about ways to make a dollar, to cut costs. As a result, we're now perceived as an auxiliary. An auxiliary, to me, means a university agency that is expected to be self-sustaining financially. I don't think that's our primary goal. I don't deny we have a service mission to provide a place to meet, a place to eat, and all the other necessary amenities for the campus. But we have to be more than that. We have to have an educational role. That's the real crux of our image problem. We're not perceived as having much important to do with education.

Johnston: Some of you have heard me mention what Chet Berry called the student personnel death wish. Chet was referring to the insecurity felt by people in college student personnel work. They try to demonstrate their worth by working 100 hours a week. They're on campus all the time and are the last to turn out the lights. I think we do have an insecurity that comes from a lack of standardization about what we do. If you're a chemist, a historian, a political scientist, your discipline requires you to perform in a certain way. There's a certain standardization relative to tenure and promotion. But if you go from one institution to another, you'll find a different kind of union. The standard is left up to either the wishes of those in charge of the institution, or the professional preparation of the union director, or the history of that specific institution in terms of its values. My goal over the next decade would be for us to start to become more professional in what we do and start to standardize what we do. I realize that is dangerously close to certification of unions and personnel, but I think we would probably benefit from more rigorous standards. We should require and demand—OK, we can't really require or demand anything—but we should at least ask for and expect higher performance from some of our colleagues.

Shindell: My perception is that we are perceived as a service station, and depending on who is doing the perceiving, we *are* a service

I don't deny we have . . . to provide a place to meet, a place to eat, and all the other necessary amenities for the campus. But we have to be more than that. We have to have an educational role. That's the real crux of our image problem. We're not perceived as having much important to do with education.

Blackburn

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

station. It's very important that that service station do the best job it possibly can in providing service. We do have an impact on quality of life. I want that service to be first rate, but I want us to be recognized for more than just being that service station. I want us to be recognized as a place where all elements of the community can come together.

We're perceived as providing nice leadership development experiences that enhance classroom learning and make students more effective as campus leaders, but I'm not sure that's viewed as having much carryover value to the corporate world, to the human services world. . . .

I want us to be recognized as a place where we can build connections, where we can tell the story of the institution. There really aren't many places on campus where that can be done day in and day out. We do that through things we have in the building that connect with the past. I want the president to say the union creates a sense of identity. We do create a sense of ownership. If students feel comfortable and if they feel strongly about that quality of life or that experience they have had, that will come back to that institution through future alumni support, through alumni identification. That has to start somewhere, and it doesn't always start on the athletic field.

How do you judge that? How do you measure that? One way you measure it is when you hear a student taking her parents through the building say, "This is where we . . . " and start referring to parts of the building as "our lounge" or "our bookstore." When you see that sense of ownership, you know you've made that connection. Those values are what we have to communicate because those are important to the upper administration. We contribute to the uniqueness of our campus and create a certain atmosphere and feeling. Those are the kinds of messages I would like us to convey.

Brattain: Some presidents feel that student leadership development experiences are rather nice but they really don't make a difference. I think we're perceived as providing nice leadership development experiences that enhance classroom learning and make students more effective as campus leaders, but I'm not sure that's viewed as having much carryover value to the corporate world, to the human services world, and to the political world. More schools are going to have to follow the lead of Texas A & M, Indiana University, and Wisconsin, schools that have stayed in touch with their student leader alumni.

I wish we were viewed as an alternative space to develop the appreciation of the arts, but we'll have to start programming in that area if we want that tag. Even if you have a lovely performing arts center on campus, the union can be an alternative space for both the visual and the performing arts.

I wish we could be viewed as a place that made some significant things happen in the area of multiculturalism. We're not a melting pot anymore. We're not a stew. We're maybe a tossed salad, and I don't think we've gotten that through to ourselves, to our student leaders. We're working at it and we're having some success, but I wish I could honestly say to presidents that we're making a difference.

Lastly, we are viewed as a regional conference center in Macomb. If you want a banquet larger than 100 at the Holiday Inn, we're the only game in town. Our building is booked up with Christmas parties. What happens if that ballroom is taken and your programming board comes up with a very creative idea or they have a chance to book a well-known speaker the faculty would like? It's the problem of balancing the use of the facility. We talked about it not being a student union, but I think it can become too much of a community facility and a conference center at the expense of students.

Brattain

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Cianciola: I'd be interested in a little reality check here. What are your reactions to our self-perceptions?

Moore: When I was talking about the money a while ago, what I was trying to get across is that when the money from the state and from student fees starts getting tight, many chancellors and presidents are looking to their auxiliary units that are generating income. You have some choices in how you interact with academic divisions, with scholarship programs. There are other ways of investing your money for a better return than just someone coming along at the end of the year and saying: "We're $600,000 short, folks. Here's the reserves of the auxiliaries. We'll take $600,000 of it."

Moore

I'll bet we're putting more and more on those things that will generate more revenues because we think that's going to save us. Instead we should be looking at the long haul and being what we say we want to be and investing in that.

Cianciola: What I hear Norman saying is, whether we like it or not, the universities are in a tight budget spot and they are going to look to us. Therefore, I think Norman has given us a helpful strategy: To preserve our priorities *and* help the university, we should take a sliver of that money and invest it in some more visible university priorities.

Moore: Another comment on something someone said about a student group failing at something and it embarrassing the institution. We can never ever have enough communication to the top of the hill about what might happen. Tell the chancellor, "Here's the list of speakers the students are bringing to campus, and we see a couple that could be controversial." Have an early warning system. Tell the chancellor when there's a potential for things to get out of hand or someone to say something that might embarrass the university. The chancellor prepares a statement he'll make public in case that happens. You don't have to have direct access to your chancellor. Use your campus's public relations people. They have that kind of access, and they know when the flares are going to go off, when dynamite is going to hit. They'll respond quickly and help you get access.

Dawson: I want to ask a question. We're talking as if all of them are like your unions, generating money and so forth. You may have some unions that don't generate anything. How are they going to get recognized?

I particularly liked what was said about establishing standards. When you talk about a faculty member as a professor, regardless of whether that person is at Slippery Rock or Harvard, I have an image that ought to be very similar. I think this think tank has to begin globalizing and thinking about standards for the total university because you may not be in a situation where you have any money to give anybody. You may need money. You may not have a fine facility.

Nuss: I'd like to add a reaction to how to tell the story and do a better job with alumni and student leader alumni. There's a perception in some places that involvement in the union is a closed club: You have to work your way up through the ranks before you're good enough to be involved in the union. That's going to work against us in that question of loyal student alumni because if, in fact, you have a small cadre who is actively involved, how does that translate to the rest of the student population? This ties into the diversity question: Is the facility hospitable to students who may have been under- represented in the past. What's the average Suzy Q and Joe going to learn from the union? That's

I'll bet we're putting more . . . on those things that will generate more revenue because we think that's going to save us. Instead we should be looking at the long haul and being what we say we want to be and investing in that.

where the service station mentality really comes through. When you ask many of these people, they like the building. It's a great place where they can do five or six one-stop shopping kinds of things. We need to look at the numbers of students we're involving, how we are involving them, and should our goal be expanding rather than contracting.

I also think we don't play up the value of student employment: what students learn in those environment, the importance of students working on campus. It is different and, I would say, better for me to work in the cafeteria than it is for me to work in McDonald's down the street. But if it isn't any different, then maybe we need to look at the options. We ought to look at employment as another hook in which we want to be able to say we've done something we couldn't have done if a particular program did not exist.

Johnston: To pick up on that same point, the Task Force 2000 found out through some very informal research—and I have to provide that caveat—that the people who find their way in to college union and student activities work are—in addition to being on boards and committees—are primarily people who work in the union. We've always suspected that, but this was pretty overwhelming. We do less in training and preparing those persons in philosophy and the union's mission than we do with the

Shindell

people on the boards who make the decisions. If that's going to be the source of the people who enter our profession, then we have to bring them into the job market better prepared.

Dawson: There's one issue we haven't touched, and I think we're going to have to talk about it. Minority students are not involved in your unions and activities. And then you let them get some little union or center on the side. What's the reason for that? If we're really talking about cultural diversity, we have to be strong enough to eliminate that. I'll use Indiana as an example because that's my school. I don't know why Indiana has two or three centers, and I bet a lot of students who go to the Black Cultural Center are not involved in the Indiana Memorial Union. Unless you get the starch to say no and get them involved, you're whistling "Dixie" when you talk about cultural diversity. If you're talking about giving status to be accepted, then you're going to have to begin as an organization—I'm not talking about individuals—to believe that these standards and resources are for every student, and programming must include every student. You have to convince the president because if he's weak or scared he's not going to do it.

Shindell: Maybe I rationalized this, but I finally decided that it is important to have that for those students, but only as a bridge.

Dawson: How long do you have to have a bridge? You didn't always have that bridge. These are hard issues that your organization is going to have to deal with.

Nuss: If I were starting in a perfect world, Martha, I don't think I would foster the small communities. But how do you have that subcommunity facility where students and individuals feel comfortable, feel welcome, and have a common bond, and still have that tie?

Dawson: I'm saying if your union is doing its job, there ought to be an opportunity to have that within the program. That's difficult, but it's something you're really going to have to face in the '90s when you're talking about the new demographics.

Brattain: Martha, if our president closed the cultural center, we would have Afro-American legislators on the campus within two or three days investigating why. That's the kind of volatile climate we're dealing with.

Dawson: I agree you would have that. I don't think you could close it right now, but if you had a comprehensive program and worked toward that end, there wouldn't be a need. I'm not saying you can do it right away, but it has to be part of your long-range planning.

Moore: When I was the union program director and when I became an associate director, when I finally became the director, I held the credo of ACU-I in my hand before my union board to say what the role was. It was not to bring people into the building and then separate them out in little corners of the building. I was fighting against the establishment at that time of a black cultural center. One of the things I've learned is "Why do we keep thinking that all black people are alike?" They have different sets of needs. We

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There has to be a perceived entree to the larger structure. The person can reject moving out of that safety zone . . . but at least that's a conscious decision. If the perception is I can't move into that, then we've done a poor job.

have some students that come to us who need that connector. They may only need it for a year, but the facility itself may need to be there for 20 years to do that, depending on your campus situation. Other black students come in and say: "Hey, I don't go for that separatism stuff. I'm mainstream." They don't use those words but that's what they're saying, and they work right into the system. Others won't ever come to that institution because it is predominantly white and you could build 15 cultural centers and they wouldn't come. I've become a firm believer that we have to have those kinds of places.

The LSU Union has had a Black Cultural Committee in its program unit for years. They have had an International Committee working there for years, and they've been developing programs not just within that building but outside of that building. We have an International Learning Center. International students voted themselves a fee of $10 per semester with the idea of establishing such a center. They started that in 1982; we bought that facility last year. Our union people are realizing it's not competition, it's not destroying what we're trying to do. In fact, they're working jointly on some programming efforts.

Johnston: Liz made a point that reinforces both of those directions. That is, if you have a Commuter Student Center, or a Black Cultural Center, or Hispanic Studies Center, or whatever it is, that should not to be an end-all but rather a starting point. If a commuter student comes in, gets up to speed, so to speak, and finds some other outlets, some other homes, some other clubs, the center has certainly been a very effective tool. My concern is if that person doesn't go beyond that. There has to be a perceived entree to the larger structure. The person can reject moving out of that safety zone into a riskier leadership zone over here, but at least that's a conscious decision. If the perception is I can't move into that, then we've done a poor job.

Brattain: If that student never gets out of Gwendolyn Brooks Center because of some comfort index, and that student stays four years and gets a degree as opposed to dropping out, then it's a relative thing in terms of success. We would prefer they get involved in student government or the programming board, or some other organization. But on the other hand, the Gwendolyn Brooks Center may be the comfortable place that keeps many students in school.

The University of Illinois is a different world from us. It's a different world in a regional university. We compete for the student. . . . The American Association of State Colleges and Universities is very concerned about retention because that recruitment pool is getting smaller. The University of Illinois may have a bad year, drop ACT scores down a couple of notches, and students we thought were firm at Southern or Eastern suddenly in the middle of summer decide to go to Champaign-Urbana.

Shindell: As competition becomes more intense, we're all going to feel that. I think the point we're making is that the quality of campus life can give us an edge and we have a direct impact on that.

Huffman and Johnston

Cianciola: Our new vice president made a comment about faculty that relates to "buying into the institutional mission." She describes the faculty as a loose federation of entrepreneurs. In terms of passing on institutional history or buying into this or that, faculty have specialties and interest areas and they're entrepreneurs in their own rank. We need to understand that as we deal with them.

Crabb: It goes back to what Martha was saying: Unions need to reach out. We have to go out and get those people involved. We can't ex-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

pect faculty to come to us. We have to go into the departments and we have to have a reason for them to want to get involved. Money is certainly part of it. But it partly translates into when a department is bringing in a person from outside we have something to offer which is to handle the speech the person is going to give. The union can cosponsor the lecture with the department.

Brattain: Even with the reward system we've got, there are faculty you can involve, and we need to build on that. I spent a little time this summer with a retired chair from Indiana who was upset because when his department gets new faculty they actually are told not to get involved in all those clubs and stuff. They tell them to make sure they get their juried articles and . . .

Dawson: But the senior faculty member of that department could be involved. I would give the same advice to new faculty. It's the name of the game. But a lot of other faculty members who have already gotten through those hoops could really be helpful. What are they doing?

Huffman: With faculty you have to do the same as you do the diverse student body. You can't put them all in one bag and say all faculty respond only to money. You have to find where their values lie, what's really important. And to some of them, yes, money is going to be important. For some, it's going to be some kind of a payoff—what does it do for me professionally. Some—like a sociologist or a psychologist—are going to buy in to a societal issue. If they can involve their students by joining in some kind of a program the union offers, then they're going to buy into it. I think you always have to ask, "What's important to this person that we can appeal to?"

Huffman

Nuss: We got through higher education with an understanding of unions. Many faculty didn't have that experience. So we have to prepare them for whatever it is we're asking them to do and not assume they know. We complain in student affairs when people assume that anybody can do our jobs, that it doesn't take any special training. And then we ask all kinds of people to help and we give them no special training for understanding. It's a mixed message.

You can't . . . say all faculty respond only to money. You have to find where their values lie, what's really important. . . . For some, it's going to be some kind of a payoff—what does it do for me professionally. Some . . . are going to buy in to a societal issue.

Moore: There are other ways you can use faculty. We went over to the College of Business and found a couple of fellows who were consulting with some big companies in assessing morale factors in those organizations. We hired them to report on the morale of our people. They interviewed the entire organization and kept everything anonymous. That report went all the way up to the board because the chancellor was so excited about the outcome. The faculty members were so impressed with the people in our organization that they started inviting them into their business classes to talk to their students about career opportunities in auxiliaries.

Johnston: I'd like the perspective from those of us who are not in the union every day about where faculty might be heading. For example, if enrollment declines, and accountability continues to be a major factor, and resources get skimpier, are we going to see faculty play a different role? We've already seen the itinerancy, if you will, of faculty being slowed down. You can no longer move through three chairs to get full professorship and tenure somewhere; most people are staying at an institution for the full time. If those opportunities are lessened, are we going to look at different criteria? For example, might community service—that little

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

thing over here that we evaluate in tenure decisions—become a bigger part of evaluation? Might involvement with the campus become a little different? Might the quality of teaching and developing mentoring relationships be considered as we evaluate people to see whether they're going to be a permanent part of our communities?

Dawson: I think it will if you as a group lobby for it.

Cianciola: Let me play devil's advocate for a second. From your perspectives, what's in it for you and what do you perceive is in it for us to get faculty involved?

Dawson: I guess what would be in it would be improved life of the student.

Cianciola: That's what's in it for me.

Dawson: Because it's more than just getting a degree. You're talking about a holistic approach to education at the university level. And that's what you have to sell. People don't see that other side. We know it, but it's not verbalized in the literature, at the conferences, and so forth.

Johnston: How about in the community colleges? Is the role of faculty changing there?

Huffman: I don't see it changing all that much. We take it for granted that because students are commuters who live right in our community that they are already involved. If the students coming in reflect the problems of the community, then working with the students to remedy those will benefit the community.

Cianciola

I don't ever recall any faculty evaluation system where the emphasis wasn't on teaching, academic advisement, and involvement in college affairs. Being involved in student activities might only be at college orientation or sponsoring a club or organization. Collective bargaining is beginning to change this. At one time faculty—if they taught in a certain area like nursing—somehow considered it their responsibility to also be involved in the Nurses Club. Anymore, we're at the collective bargaining table, and faculty are willing to do that so long as there's something green in the hand for doing that. But I don't see the faculty role changing at the community college as much as what it may at the university level.

Dawson: I have another question. What do you see in terms of older students? We're talking as if all students are going to be 18 or 22. Have you given any thought to that in your programming?

Johnston: We've done a very poor job at that. Even when I was at Cal State–Los Angeles, which was 65 percent "minority" and at that stage 100 percent commuter, the only people we could involve were 18- to 22-year-olds. That's who we were reaching with the programs. Now the service side did draw everybody on the campus. But clubs, organizations, and programs did not appeal or students were not there at the times they were offered. Even at schools where you hear that's not the case, you can go back and examine who's involved. It tends to be the traditional-aged people in a non-traditional setting. At least, that's been my experience.

Crabb: I think their involvement is in attending a program, which is part of a program responsibility as well. We forget that because too often we think about a program in terms of what it provides for the students planning the program.

Brattain: I don't have any research, but I have a feeling the two-year institutions are probably doing a much better job at this than either the residential institutions or even the big urban institutions because they've had to do it. Many times we assume the non-traditional and older students have to work and they don't want college activities. The literature suggests they want as much of the collegiate experience as they can get. We have to create more avenues; we're still programming with the same number of committees under a union board, and you have to sign up for the whole year. We need to learn from the two-year schools.

There are unions out there with one professional, and we need to keep that in mind as we do our publications. If you're the union director at Gettysburg College or College of Wooster or wherever, you may be able to do some things with the faculty that we're unable to do at a regional state institution or a research-oriented institution.

To be continued in March

BEST COPY AVAILABLE